PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING - RED WING

SEPTEMBER 10, 2008 - 7:00 P.M.

STATE OF MINNESOTA

OFFICE OF ENERGY SECURITY

In the Matter of a Northern States Power Company (Xcel Energy) Certificate of Need Applications and Site Permit Application for an Extended Power Uprate and Additional Dry Cask Storage at the Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plant

PUC DOCKET NOs: E002/CN-08-509
E002/CN-08-510
E002/GS-08-690

Red Wing Public Library
Foot Room
225 East Avenue
Red Wing, Minnesota 55066

Met, pursuant to Notice, at 7:00 in the evening on September 10, 2008.

COURT REPORTER: Christine Munson

I N D E X

MR. STORM: Okay. Folks, I'm going to begin, and we'll let people trickle in as they will.

Good evening. I want to thank you for coming. My name is Bill Storm. I am a project manager with the Department of Commerce, Office of Energy Security, Energy Facility Permitting Unit.

We're here tonight to hold an initial public meeting, an environmental scoping document meeting, for three dockets that are currently before the PUC. Those dockets are the certificate of need docket for the extended power uprate, the site permit docket for the extended power uprate, and the certificate of need docket for the request for additional dry storage casks.

Before I begin, I would like to go over just a few logistical items. If you wouldn't mind, I ask people to sign in at the front desk. That way it allows me to track what kind of participation I'm getting at these forums that we give. And that sign-in sheet is at the front desk.

And also, if you know you want to speak tonight, I have green cards on that desk. I ask that you fill out a green card and give it to my colleague, Ray Kirsch. And then at the end of tonight's presentation, I will call on the audience

from these cards and allow people to speak onto the record.

If you are not sure that you want to speak yet, don't worry about it. Once I get through the cards, then I'll ask for a show of hands, and we'll call on you from a show of hands.

Other items that are on the front desk are a boilerplate comment sheet. We are having the meeting tonight to inform the public of the process, but we're also here to solicit the public's items that they would like to see in the environmental document that we're going to be producing for these three projects.

There's going to be a comment period associated with this part of the process, and that comment period is open until October 7. You can submit your comments to me via e-mail, or you can come up and speak tonight. But as a tool, I made out this sheet that has a spot for you to comment. It has the docket numbers that we're talking about, and you can just fax or mail this to me at your leisure, or you can give it to me and Ray tonight before you leave.

Another item that's up there on the table is the draft scoping document. As I said, we're

here tonight for two reasons. One is to have the company provide information to the public about the projects, and there are three of them that they're doing tonight, and also to solicit comments from the public on what your areas of concern and your issues are that you would like to see me incorporate into the environmental document that I have to produce for these three dockets.

This draft environmental scope is what I think should be in the environmental document. It serves as a foundation for you, the public, to review, see if I've captured your concerns, and if I haven't, to comment -- to comment on that. So that's an important piece of information.

Lastly, there's a fact sheet just about the process up there, and this just talks generally about the site permitting process. Additionally, Xcel has some information on the projects that they're proposing. I believe the CON application for the power uprate is up there, the site permit application for the site permit that they're requesting, and the CON application for the additional dry cask storage, I believe, are on that desk there.

I do want to take a moment to introduce

my colleague, Ray Kirsch. He works on our staff, too, and he'll be assisting me with this project as we move forward. Also, we have Bob Cupit here from the PUC staff. The PUC, the Public Utilities Commission, are the ultimate decision-maker in this process.

And then there are representatives here from Xcel Energy. What we're going to do tonight is we're going to allow Xcel to have a short PowerPoint presentation about the three projects that they are proposing. Then it will come back to me, and I will give you a short description of the processes and how I'm going to try to join these three processes together. And then for the most important part, we'll turn it over to you for your comments and questions.

So what I would like to do now is introduce Mike Wadley. And Mike will start -- begin the Xcel presentation. As I said, it will come back to me, and we will move on from there.

MR. WADLEY: Thank you, Bill.

Good evening. First of all, I'd like to just go over a little bit about the plant and these projects. The three projects we're talking about is an extended power uprate, additional storage to

support -- for the used nuclear fuel, as well as license renewal.

Prairie Island continues to be an important element in Xcel Energy, Northern States Power's energy source for the Upper Midwest. Prairie Island supplies about 20 percent of the energy used by our customers in Minnesota.

Just an overview, quickly, of Prairie Island. Prairie Island is a pressurized water nuclear reactor. We have two units at the site. Operation began in 1973 and in 1974. Each unit is approximately 550 megawatts of capacity. This provides baseload seven days a week, 24 hours a day. So these are one of the plants that continue to run day-in and day-out to provide that energy to our customers.

We've made some significant modifications as we've gone along with the plant. The steam generators, which convert the heated water that comes from the reactor into steam, to be used in the turbine to make electricity -- to spin a turbine to make electricity. The Unit 1 steam generators were replaced in 2004. The Unit 2 steam generators -- analysis shows that they're -- can still operate to the end of license life, but they will be replaced

as part of the license renewal period.

Reactor vessel heads has been an important issue within the nuclear industry. Both the reactor vessel heads in Prairie Island were replaced.

Even though the plant is some 35 years old, we still have extreme high levels of reliability. The plant is taken off line every 18 to 20 months where we replace one-third of the fuel in the reactor. Now, that fuel is taken to wet storage and placed in there for up to -- up to 10 to 15 years of cooling.

We continue to have a good performance at the plant. From the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's perspective, Prairie Island is rated in the license response category of the Reactor Oversight Program, which is the least amount of oversight from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, based on performance and adherence to regulations.

Prairie Island is also a facility that does not emit any carbon dioxide with the production of energy. Extremely important with today's concerns of global warming.

This (indicating throughout) is a simplified diagram of a pressurized water reactor.

We really have three separate loops that circulate water in the plant. This is a generic view. Prairie Island has two operating circuits for our reactor coolant system. That's the area shown in red. That represents the highest temperature loop in the system. Water is circulated from pumps -- pumps circulate through the reactor where it removes heat from the fuel.

That water then circulates the steam generators and gives up its heat to feed water on the secondary side. That feed water turns to steam, the steam is routed through a turbine where it gives up its energy, and we use it to make electricity. Exhaust from the turbine is then condensed for reuse, and cooling water from the Mississippi River is pumped through the condenser.

So we have three loops: Primary, secondary, tertiary, with a cascading temperature profile. The secondary loops, the water that is used to produce steam to turn the turbine, does not pass through the reactor. That is separated by the steam generator tubes.

Okay. Next I would like to have Brian Zelenak come up. Brian is our manager of regulatory affairs.

MR. ZELENAK: Thank you.

Good evening. Our proposals, the two certificates of need that we filed, as Mike and Bill have said, one is for asking -- asking for additional dry cask storage to support the continued operation of the plant through a license renewal period of 2033, 2034. And the second is to increase the output of the plant by 82 megawatts on each unit, or 164 megawatts.

I actually can't see from here. I'm going to step over here, if that's okay.

The independent spent fuel storage facility is licensed by the NRC to store 48 dry casks. Currently there are 24 casks at the ISFSI. We have state authorization to place up to 29 casks, which is the amount that we're estimating we will need for -- to operate the plant for the original license period, which ends in the 2013, 2014 time period.

The extended power uprate, that portion of the project, will not add any additional casks. With or without the power uprate, if we continue to operate the plant an additional 20 years, we'll have the same amount of casks on the ISFSI. That would be the 64.

If we were to shut down Prairie Island, a total of 68 casks would be needed to store all the fuel for the first 40 years of operation, which is the first license, and to empty the pool and decommission the plant. If we renew the license until another 20 years, until 2034, we would actually need a total of 98 casks for the original 40-year license, the extended 20-year license, and then all the decommissioning. That would be a full 98.

Here's a picture of the actual ISFSI. The plant's in the background. The ISFSI itself is about five and a half acres. As you can see here, there's a berm around the ISFSI that's approximately 17 feet high. The actual ISFSI is about 720 feet long by 340 feet wide.

We currently have two concrete pads. One here to here, and the other down here, where we have 24 dry casks stored on there. Those concrete pads that are already there will accommodate the 48 casks that we need for the first 40-year license period, which storage beyond those 48 casks will be accomplished by utilizing the remaining capacity at the ISFSI.

What we're basically going to do is add

35 additional casks to support that next 20 years. And what we're looking at here, this is the first pad and the second pad. This shows actually more casks on the pad than are currently there. What we'd be doing is adding two concrete slabs to the south end of the existing concrete slabs where the additional casks would be placed.

One thing in this proposal that we're looking at is we are not proposing changing any of the boundaries. The berm will stay the same, the fencing stays the same. The only thing that changes are the additional two concrete slabs to house the casks.

This is just a picture of one of the casks. It holds 40 used fuel assemblies. Its cask shell is seven and a quarter inches -- inch thick steel cylinder, which has a carbon steel containment vessel another one and a half inches thick. And it's got a lid that's 10 inches thick bolted down by 48 bolts. It's about, approximately, 16 and a half feet tall.

As I said, we'd add up to 35 additional casks during the relicense period, and we do say up to 35 casks because a number of those casks won't be needed until a period further out in the future.

And the farther out we go in the future, the more likely there will be some sort of place for a centralized disposal of these.

It was actually on Monday, I believe, the NRC did acknowledge and accept the Yucca Mountain permit and docketed the DOE's applications for Yucca Mountain. So there is progress that is being made. Although a little bit slower than some of us would like, there is progress going still towards a federal repository.

One of the benefits here is the construction will be within the existing footprint of the ISFSI. There is not going to be any changes to noise, air quality, no releases of any type of radioactive materials: Liquids, solids, or gases. The used fuel in the cask will emit low levels of radiation to the environment. We've done calculations and that additional low level radiation still will be well within any of our regulatory limits that the NRC sets.

Continued operation of the plant provides significant benefits to our customers and the local economy and the environment. As Mike mentioned, Prairie Island is one of our, kind of, workhorse plants. It runs 24 hours a day. It's a very, very

good operating -- we have a good safety records, very high reliability.

It provides many benefits. One benefit in this, we're continuing to use an existing site. If we would have to replace Prairie Island with some other form of generation, we would have to go look at other nondeveloped sites. Here we'll be able to continue using the site for the purpose that it's been -- been used for a number of years. And it's a very significant benefit, I think, to the people and the environment.

As a nuclear facility, you're not going to have greenhouse gases that you will have from fossil fuel plants. Everyone knows the concern over global warming is getting more and more every day. This is a huge benefit.

Kind of, what if we did not get the license renewal from the NRC or the storage is denied? We need both to continue operating the plant. If we did not get either one, we would have to shut down Unit 1 in 2013 at the end of its license, and we would have to shut down Unit 2 in 2014. We would then begin the decommissioning process.

And to decommission the plant, we would

need 39 additional casks to house the used fuel that are currently in the reactor and the wet storage in the storage pool. We would also then have to start looking for energy from other sources to replace that 1,100 megawatts of energy, that's 20 percent of the -- Xcel Energy's energy needs that Mike mentioned.

The extended power uprate -- we're proposing to add 164 megawatts, as we mentioned. The power uprate's achieved by increasing the heat that's produced in the reactor. And by doing that, that will result in more steam being produced by the steam generators. And then there's a number of balance of plant changes that take place that allow us to convert that additional steam into electricity.

In general, the operation of the plant will not change. The reactor will be operated at a higher thermal level, and some of the balance of plant changes are going to be a new high-pressure turbine, turbine control valves, step-up transformer, and generator replacement and rewinds.

The impact of this power uprate -- the proposed power uprate is actually very minimal. There's not going to be any change to the existing

footprint. The power uprate takes place within the existing footprint. It takes place within the existing building on the existing footprint. We can implement the power uprate within the limits of all our existing permits that we currently operate the plant under. We're not going to have to change any of those air-, water-type of permits.

The plant will use slightly -- will be a slight increase in the use of water at the plant, and the discharge temperature will increase slightly. We've done some calculations, and we looked at that, the potential -- the maximum potential for that would be about a three-degree change in the discharge temperature of the plant. About a mile or so downstream, where we actually measure that again, we look at what the temperature is downstream of the plant. We're calculating it to be about a two-tenths of a degree change downstream, about a mile, mile and a half downstream.

There will be a minimal increase in offsite accumulative radiation dose. I think the key here is that we will stay -- after the power uprate, that additional 164 megawatts, we will stay well within all the current NRC regulatory rules for offsite radiation dosage. That's a very big plus.

Some of the financial benefits, they're very significant to our customers. As we've said, Prairie Island is a very well operated, well run plant. It provides low-cost, non-carbon-emitting energy. That's a huge benefit in holding rates down, especially comparatively speaking to other states and other regions of the country.

There's huge environmental benefits. There will be a reduction in carbon. If we did not pursue the uprate, we would have to pursue some other form of generation to replace that 164 megawatts. Presumably, some of that generation would be a fossil-fuel type generation in order get the same reliability that we're getting from this baseload plant. That is going to have greenhouse gas emissions associated with that generation.

One of the nice pieces about this project uprate at the nuclear plant is that when we've done our modeling, not only do we not have to add additional fossil fuel, but this new generation, combined with the renewable energy requirement for Xcel actually allows us to take some of the existing fossil-fuel plants that we have and run them less hours per year.

And when we run those less hours per

year, we're getting more energy from a non-carbon-emitting plant with a lower cost to operate. And so that provides -- not only are we not increasing the carbon level, but we're actually, in some essence, decreasing the cost and decreasing the carbon level to customers going forward by adding the generation at this plant.

Kind of in conclusion, Prairie Island is a -- plays a very significant role for our system, both in the reliability costs and from the environmental standpoint. It will help us meet our goals cost-effectively. It does keep us as an environmentally-friendly utility. Neither of the projects, the additional dry cask storage, pose any type of health risks to anyone.

Those types of issues, health and safety, are issues that the NRC does address during the relicensing process. We address a lot of the environmental impacts in state-type proceedings, which this is designed to help gather the public's comments on the environmental impacts of either of these projects.

And with that, we look forward to hearing people's comments, answering questions towards the end of the presentation there, and working with you

throughout the process.

MR. STORM: Thanks, Brian.

Okay. I just want to jump back. Okay. That was Xcel's presentation on what they're proposing.

What I'd like to do, and I'll try to do it briefly, is run through the state process that evaluates and looks at the applications, the three applications before the PUC, and also where the public will have an opportunity to comment and to participate in the process.

And I just wanted to frame it in such a way so that we realize there are three dockets -- three proposals before the Commission currently. The extended power CON, the certificate of need for the extended power, the site permit for the extended power, and the need determination for the additional dry-cask storage. And what I'm going to do is run through the process associated with each of those dockets separately because, even though you'll see some overlap, they are a little different.

And then, lastly, I will show you how I'm going to put them together and try to capture the requirements of all three of the docket proceedings. And then we'll turn it over to your questions. So,

bear with me in this attempt.

So, first of all, my name is Bill Storm. I work for the Department of Commerce, Office of Energy Security, Energy Facility Permitting Unit. And what we do -- me and Ray and our colleagues in our office, we assist the PUC, the Commission, who is the ultimate decision-maker in these dockets. We assist them with procedure, and we develop the environmental reports that each of the dockets' procedures require.

And this just shows our relationship. And the PUC does new projects, pipelines, they do power plants, and they do transmission lines.

The first docket that I'm going to talk about tonight is the CON, the certificate of need, for the extended power uprate. And it has its own docket number, E002, and that refers to the utility, the utilities are each given their own number. CN, which refers to the fact that it's a certificate of need docket. 08, the year, and 509 is just the case number.

Since the -- the proposal for the extended power uprate that Xcel is proposing for Prairie Island, since it will increase the generating capacity of the Prairie Island plant

greater than 50 megawatts, by statute and rule a CON is required, a certificate of need is required.

On May 16, 2008, Xcel Energy submitted a CON application to document -- support its position that the Prairie Island extended power uprate was the most cost-effective means of meeting this 164 megawatt need.

On July 15, 2008, the Commission accepted the CON application as substantially complete. What that means is that the application came in the -- there are statutes and rules that specify what information has to be in that application. The Commission reviewed and determined that did meet that level. They accept the application as substantially complete and that pretty much starts our process.

And, unfortunately, our process looks like this. I'm going to run you through the process. And you'll see I have three of these for the three dockets, and you'll see how some of these blocks and milestones are similar. So you'll see how I'm going to pull them together, and you'll also -- we'll also discuss how they are different.

First of all, the Applicant submits an application. The PUC, the Commission, reviews it,

and they either accept or reject the application. Once they accept the application, the next step in the flow chart is the public meeting, and that's why we're here tonight.

The purpose of this public meeting is to provide you, the public, with information about what Xcel wants to do. And secondly, to solicit from you areas of concern, specific issues that you have that you want to make sure that I cover in my environmental document. So that's the comments I'm looking for from you tonight.

And as for the extended comment period, once the meeting is over tonight there will be a comment period for you to submit written comments. And as an example, I gave you the comment sheet that you can fill out and send it in, but you can just send me an e-mail, you can write me a letter. The comment period is open until October 7. So you have until October 7 to give me your comments.

Once that comment period closes, I will take your comments, and I think there is a draft -- as I pointed out, there's a draft scoping decision that's on the table. That's what I think should be in the document. So I'll take that, which is what I think, and I'll take what you guys think, and I will

make a recommendation to the Commissioner of the Department of Commerce. And the Commissioner of the Department of Commerce makes a decision on what the scope should be, and that decision is called a scoping decision.

Once the Commissioner signs that scoping decision, me and staff will start writing the environmental document. And in this case, for a CON for the extended power uprate, the environmental document is called an ER, environmental report. The environmental report looks at the environmental and human health effects around size, type, and timing of a given project that's put forth to the Commission.

Once I complete the environmental report, we will go into the contested case phase of this procedure. The contested case is a public hearing. It's the second opportunity for the public to step forward and ask questions. It's a public hearing held before an ALJ, an administrative law judge, and one of the purposes of this meeting is for the public to ask questions directly of the utility and of the utility's experts on various issues that they're interested in, and also to submit evidence and testimony into the record concerning the

application -- the whole application.

The hearing will be held, it will adjourn. The ALJ will set up a comment period for that hearing, it's usually 10 days. It's up to the ALJ how he wants to set that up. Once the comment period ends, the ALJ will then allow the formal parties -- and these are people who have petitioned the ALJ that they want to be given formal party status. Once the hearing closes and the comment period closes, the ALJ will allow the formal parties to submit briefs and reply briefs.

And then the ALJ will release a report. And that report will be his finding of facts and his comments and his recommendations on the need for the extended power uprate. Once he releases that report, the official parties will be allowed to submit exceptions to that report to the ALJ, and there will be a certain period of time that they're allowed to do that.

Once that period closes, the record and the ALJ's report will come back to staff, and we will bring it before the Commission for a final determination on the need for the extended power uprate.

So that's how that process runs, and I

will get into how to become a formal party. You can participate in the public hearing without being a formal party, but the briefs and the exceptions that happen afterward, you have to be a formal party. And I will go over how to get there as we move along.

As I said, the environmental report for the CON for the extended power uprate must contain information on the human, health, and environmental impacts associated with size, type, and timing.

And the public hearing, again, it requires a public hearing, that's an opportunity for the public to -- again, to participate. The objective of the public hearing is to allow the public to ask questions of the utility and the utility's experts and, also to enter testimony and evidence into the record.

And just for the record, on July 22, 2008, order -- when the Commission accepted the application as substantially complete, they also referred it to the Office of Administrative Hearings for a contested case hearing. And as I said, the ALJ will issue a report containing findings, conclusions, recommendations on the need for the extended power uprate.

And that was the extended power uprate process, how that flows and where you can participate.

The next docket is the site permit docket, and it has its own docket number. The E002 is the same because the utility is the same. GS just distinguishes that it's a generating docket, it's a generator, it's a plant. 08, the year, and 690, again, is just a case number.

And as with the CON, in statute there are thresholds, and a 164 megawatt increase at the Prairie Island plant crosses the threshold in statute that makes this project, this proposal, require a site permit from the PUC prior to construction.

Now, when we do site permits, there two processes that we can use when we review an application for a site permit. There's a full process, which can take up to a year, and there's the alternative process, which may take up to six months. Both processes require environmental review and public participation.

On August 1, 2008, Xcel submitted a site permit application to the PUC for the extended power uprate. The extended power uprate -- because of the

nature of the uprate, it's a nuclear plant, and the amount of increase, it does not qualify for the alternative process. So they have to go the full process. So this review of this application for the site permit for the extended power uprate will follow the full process.

And another flow sheet. And you can see some similarities between these flow sheets and the previous flow sheet when the application is submitted, it's either rejected or accepted. When the Commission -- when I bring -- when the application comes in and I review it to see that it's complete and, again, just like the CON rules, the site permit rules specify what has to be in the application.

What I'll do is I'll look at the application and review it, and we'll make a recommendation to the Commission whether all the information's there. At that time, the Commission will either determine that the information -- all the information is there and they'll accept the application, they'll accept the application pending additional information coming in, you know, or they'll reject it.

Another decision they make at that time

is a public advisor, they appoint a public advisor for the project. For this project Ray Kirsch is the Office of Environmental Security's public advisor. He's there to help assist people with the process, if they have questions about how do I participate, how do I send a letter in.

The third decision that the Commission typically makes during that acceptance point is whether they should assign an advisory task force or not. The assigning of a citizens' advisory task force is discretionary. And in this case, for this project, they stayed that decision. When I presented the application to the Commission I gave -- I gave them my recommendation, which was we don't need an advisory task force. But I gave them three options: Go with my recommendation, we don't need an advisory task force; to authorize an advisory task force; or to not make a decision at this time. And it's that third option that they chose during the acceptance of this application.

Now, the rules specify that the public may -- if they feel that they want a task force they may petition the PUC for a task force. And they write to the executive director of the PUC, and they request to be put on an agenda to have that decision

made, whether or not there should be a task force.

But anyway, once the application is accepted, we move to the next step, which is the public meeting. It looks just like the step in the CON process, and its purpose is pretty much the same. We're here to give information to the public on the process, we give the applicant an opportunity to talk. And the second thing, which is we're here to solicit comments on what the public would like to see in the environmental document. In this case, the environmental document for this proceeding is an Environmental Impact Statement.

Okay. Again, I point to the table with my draft scoping decision. You can see what I think should be in the environmental document. And as the CON scope, the environmental document scope for the CON, focused on human and environmental impacts associated with size, type, and timing, the scope for the EIS -- for the site permit looks at the -- the impact of -- on -- humans and the environment at that particular site.

Okay. Once the public -- once this meeting is over tonight there will be a comment period. The comment period is the same comment period as the previous docket. The comment period

closes October 7 for the previous docket and for this docket. So submit your comments to me. E-mail, use your own stationery or the form that I submitted to you, or step up and speak at the end of the presentation tonight.

Once the comment period closes, again, I will make a recommendation to the Commissioner of the Department of Commerce who makes the scoping decision. Again, you see my draft, where I'm heading with the scoping decision. I will take that and I will take your input, and I'll make a recommendation to the Commissioner of the Department of Commerce, and he will determine what the scope will be.

Once that decision is released, I and Ray will start working on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Once we finish the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, we will hold another meeting down here just on the environmental -- just on the environmental impact -- the draft environmental. This is your second opportunity -- this will be your second opportunity to come and speak to the project.

During this meeting we ask you that -- to look at the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, look at the scope that was released. If you think

that we've dropped the ball on an issue or you think some issue needs to be fleshed out more, that's what we're looking for comment on during that meeting. And like all our meetings, there will be a comment period following the meeting, usually 10 days.

Once that comment periods ends, I'll begin working on the Final EIS. The Final EIS is basically the Draft EIS, a tabulation of your comments and comments from other agencies also, and my answer and my responses to them. That answer and response may be new information that I provide, it may be clarification on information that I have provided but just providing it in a more clarified way.

While this is going on, while I'm working on the Final EIS, the contested case hearing will start. As you'll remember, the previous docket also required a contested case hearing. And the purpose of it is pretty much the same. The contested case hearing is the third opportunity for the public to get involved. It's an opportunity for the public to ask questions of the utility and the utility's experts, to directly ask questions of them, and to enter testimony and evidence of their own.

And as with that other process, that

hearing will come to a close and there will be a comment period. The comment period will be established by the ALJ presiding over that hearing. And then in my efforts to try to combine these, we're going to have the same ALJ for both these contested case hearings.

Anyway, the contested case hearing ends, the comment period ends. Once the comment period ends and I enter the Final EIS into the record, the ALJ will close the record. And then that, again, will start the process where those people who have a petition to become formal parties will be able to put briefs and reply briefs in.

The ALJ will then release his report. And his report will have findings, conclusions, recommendations, but this time it will be on the site permit, whether to grant the site permit and what conditions should be associated with that site permit, should it be granted. The judge will release his report. The official -- the formal parties will have the option of submitting exceptions to the report.

Once that time period ends, the record and the judge's report will come back to staff. And again, I will come before the Commission for a final

decision. Now, in this procedure the final decision will be three parts. The Commission will be asked to determine if the EIS is adequate, the Commission will be asked to determine if the site should be -- if the site permit should be granted, and what conditions should be associated with that site permit.

So that's -- that's the full process. And again, these next slides just cover, again -- the one thing I do want to point out is, under the full process, normally an applicant has to come in with their application with two sites. They need to come in with a preferred site and an alternative site. An example would be if XYZ Utility wanted to build a coal plant in Fairmont, they would have to come in not only with that coal plant, but they'd have to come in with another coal plant siting on an alternative site.

For this docket, under these proceedings, since there's a moratorium in Minnesota on new nuclear plants, that requirement is sort of moot. Now, in the previous docket, the CON for the uprate docket, in the ER, in the environmental report, we will look at alternative types. We will look at should this 164 megawatts come from coal, should it

come from wind, should it come from gas. We will look at that. But in this docket, where we would normally look at an alternative site for a nuclear -- for another plant -- the same plant, we can't, because you can't site a new plant -- a new nuclear plant in Minnesota.

Anyway, as I stated, we hold a public meeting, we prepare an EIS, we have a public hearing, and the full process takes approximately a year to reach its final decision.

One other thing I wanted to mention, and Brian touched on this a little bit, there are other permits that this plant operates under. They operate under a permit from the DNR to take water out of the river, they operate under a permit from the PCA to discharge into the river, and they operate under a permit to discharge into the air.

In this process that I do, these siting processes, state agencies that have permit authority behind me or downstream of me, the PCA with their air permit, the PCA with their discharge, the DNR with their water permit, they, by rule, have to participate in my process. So I'm not here doing this alone, I do pull the other groups in to try to get their input. And the way I do this is when I

get an application, I send it out to the representatives from the various agencies to get their comments on it. When I do a draft scope I send it out to get their comments on it. I invite them to the public meetings. So we are trying to solicit input not only from the public, but from the other agencies.

Okay. That was the siting docket. The third docket is the certificate of need associated with the request for additional dry cask storage. Again, it has its own docket number: E002, because it's Xcel -- it's the utility. CN because it is a certificate of need docket, 08 is the year, 510 is just the case number.

Okay. By statute, Xcel Energy must obtain a CON, a certificate of need, from the PUC to add additional dry storage casks to the ISFSI at Prairie Island. And these procedures and criteria are spelled out in both statute and rule, and that's just for your reference.

Another thing I wanted to point out to you is -- well, I'm ahead myself. On May 16, when they submitted their CON application for the uprate, they also submitted an application for the additional dry cask storage. And on July 15 the

Commission accepted that application, the dry -- the CON application for dry cask storage -- additional dry cask storage as acceptable. So just to give you that.

The one point I want to make is the CON process must address the impacts of operation of Prairie Island beyond 2014. So we will be looking at, in our environmental document, the operation of the plant to the relicensing date.

And one other point on the CON for the additional dry cask storage is if, when we get through this whole process, the PUC, the Commission, does grant the CON, that decision is stayed by statute until the legislature meets. And during their next session the legislature has the option of modifying that decision.

Okay. Another flow chart. Here again, you can see the similarities. Application is accepted or rejected. Because this docket follows just a little bit different rules, some of the procedures are just a little bit different. The application is accepted -- once the application is accepted, we go into the public meeting. Before we have a public meeting, the rules for this docket specify that I must put together the draft scoping

document. Now, I always put a draft scoping document together regardless just so the public has a foundation, but under this docket I'm required to. I'm normally not required by rule to do it, but I do it anyway.

The next block is public meeting. Again, we're here for the same reasons as we were in the last two flow charts, to provide information to the public and to solicit from the public what you want to see in the environmental scope, which will dictate what will be in the environmental document. The environmental document in this case is an Environmental Impact Statement. So it will be pretty similar to the previous docket I just went through.

We'll have this public meeting. There was a comment period following this meeting. Again, in an effort to try to put these three dockets here -- the comment period closes October 7 for this docket. If you have comments on what you would like to see me incorporate in the environmental document relative to the CON for the additional dry cask storage, please get it me by October 7. And again, you can use the form I provided, or you can just write me a letter, or come up here and speak and get

it on the record.

Once the comment period closes, again, the scoping decision will be released. Again, the scoping decision -- excuse me -- is released by the Commissioner of the Department of Commerce. Once he signs off on the scoping decision, I and Ray and our staff will start assembling the Draft EIS.

When the Draft EIS is complete, we will come back for a meeting to bring the Draft EIS before you. And just as in previous instances, this is your second opportunity to speak, and what we're doing during this meeting is we're asking you to speak on the Draft EIS. Is there something you think we missed, is there something you need clarification on.

That meeting, again, will close and there will be a comment period, usually 10 days. Once that comment period closes I will start writing the Final EIS. I will take the draft scoping -- or the scope now at this point, and your comments -- your comments on the Draft EIS, and I will tabulate them and give you responses to them. At the same time that I'm doing this work on the Final EIS, the contested case hearing will start. And as in the previous two dockets, the contested case hearing

will be presided over by an ALJ. It will be an opportunity for the public to ask questions directly of the utility and the representatives and it will also be an opportunity for the public to submit testimony into the report.

The ALJ will end the public contested case hearing. You will have a public comment period. When that public comment period ends, and at the same time I submit my Final EIS into the record, the hearing will close. The ALJ, again, will allow official parties to submit briefs and reply briefs. He will then release a report looking at findings, conclusions, recommendations, and this time the report will be on the need for the dry cask storage.

Once he releases that report, the official parties have an opportunity to submit exceptions to the report. Once that is done, the ALJ will give me the record and give the staff the record and give his report back. And I will be bringing it before the PUC for a final decision. The PUC will make a decision on the need for the additional dry cask storage. The only curl here that's different from the previous dockets that you've seen is here the adequacy of the EIS -- the

decision is made by the Department of Commerce Commissioner.

And the way we're going to work that is we're going to develop a Draft Environmental Impact -- we're going to develop an Environmental Impact Statement that has two parts to it. The first part will cover the first two dockets, the second part will cover this last docket. And that allows for the Commissioner of the Department of Commerce to make an adequate decision on that second part, whereas the first part the Commission makes the decision on the adequacy of the environmental document.

And so you see I've got three processes I'm running here, and I'm -- want you to not waste your time and have you come out every third Tuesday for the next however long for these meetings. I'm combining the meetings. I've combined this meeting, the public information meeting, the comment period that goes along with this meeting, so I'm going to combine these things.

And this is how I'm going to do it. There are three dockets relative to Prairie Island. Each of them requires an environmental review document. The CON for the EPU requires an

environmental report, the site permit for the EPU requires an Environmental Impact Statement, and CON for the additional dry cask storage requires an Environmental Impact Statement. What I'm doing -- what our staff is doing is we're holding one public meeting, one scoping meeting, and we're going to develop one scope and we're going to release one environmental document. That environmental document will be called an EIS and that environmental document will satisfy the requirements of the processes.

And if that wasn't bad enough, we're also strongly encouraging the Office of Administrative Hearings to do the same with the contested case hearings. We think there will be efficiencies gained if the ALJ combines the hearings for this process. Now, it's up to the ALJ how he does that and how much of that he adopts. If he wants to hold the contested case hearing as part one, part two, or part three, or if he wants to just leave the door open for everything. That's something that the ALJ will have to decide. And part of that decision -- I went ahead. Part of that decision will be made at the prehearing conference.

Now, the ALJ assigned for these three

dockets is Richard Luis, and his contact information is on the slide.

I want to let you know that if you want to become a formal party to these proceedings, then I strongly encourage you to come to the prehearing conference this Friday. It's in St. Paul at the Commission building, large hearing room. Now, you don't have to be a formal party to participate in this meeting, to participate in the meeting on the Draft EIS, or to participate in the contested case hearing. But you have to be a formal party to participate in the briefs and reply briefs and the exceptions to the judge's report.

And if -- the judge's contact information is provided there. If you have questions, you can contact him about how to become a party -- how to petition to become a party. And like I said, we're having a prehearing conference this Friday.

Okay. I'm almost done, folks. If you're interested in tracking the various documents, the draft scoping decision, the application, the final scoping decision, the environmental document, comment letters that I receive from the public, we put them on our website so you can see them. There are two websites that you can see them at. There's

one that I and Ray and my staff maintain, and it's the first URL address that's listed there. If you go to that website and you go to power plants and you look up Prairie Island, you will see a table that will list all these documents. They're in PDF form, you can click on them and download them and review them.

There's also another website, it's eDockets. It's the official record for the PUC, and it can be found at the second URL that's given there. If you go to eDockets and you want to look at documents of record for either of these particular documents, what you do is you go to that URL, hit eDockets and efiling, select documents, and then entering the year and the file number for the corresponding docket that you want to look at. So that's if you want information.

Okay. I'm going to take your comments and before I do, I just want to say a few things. One is, try to limit your speech to five minutes initially. If we have time we'll certainly come back to you. Also, I'll have Ray give you a mike to speak. Please state your name and spell it for the court reporter, and speak slower than I've spoken tonight so that she can catch everything.

And I do want to remind you that comment sheets for the scope are due October 7. And try to -- I know people have all kinds of questions and comments. What I would like you to do is, for tonight, focus your comments and questions on the environmental report, things that you would like to see in the environmental report. I know some people may have questions on personal property taxes and other issues or very, very technical issues. If you have moderately technical issues we can certainly answer them tonight. But very, very technical issues, we can deal with that during the public hearing when you actually -- when Xcel actually has its experts here. And you can actually cross them, basically, by asking them things.

So what I'll do is I'll -- that's another reminder for the comment period. What I'll do is I'll use the cards that we collected, and I'll call you. Ray will come over. Feel free to make your comment or ask your question. Once I'm through with the cards, if anybody wants to speak I'll call on you individually. Again, speak clearly, say, spell your name, and let's begin.

Charlotte Eastin. Would you stand up, please, Charlotte? Ray will come to you, Charlotte.

MS. EASTIN: Hi. I'm Charlotte Eastin, E-A-S-T-I-N. I don't represent anybody but myself.

The situation here reminds me of something that happened in my husband's family. His grandmother, Jessie Tucker, was never a real good driver, even in her prime. She always drove too fast, and the family nicknamed her Leadfoot Jessie.

The older she got, the less safe she became. She started running into mailboxes and ditches and missing the driveway. Finally, the family had to come together and tell her, we're sorry, Grandma, we need to take your license away before the unthinkable happens.

And you probably can guess where I'm going here, but it seems to me that the Prairie Island Nuclear Plant is our Leadfoot Jessie. It was never a safe way to generate electricity to begin with, and the risks increase as the plant ages. It is time for us as a community to say we're sorry, but we need to take your license away before the unthinkable happens. And we have until 2014 to replace the nuclear plant with a truly green technology.

MR. STORM: Thank you, Charlotte. If you would like to give me your written comment, I

will -- I can take that for the record, too. Or what you've done is enough, for sure. But --

MS. EASTIN: Okay.

MR. STORM: Next we have Elizabeth -- say it, please.

MS. BEARHEELS: BearHeels.

MR. STORM: BearHeels. Oh, okay. Elizabeth, if I could get you to stand up, and state and spell your name for the court reporter.

MS. BEARHEELS: Elizabeth BearHeels. And BearHeels is B-E-A-R, capital H, E-E-L-S. And I'm from Prairie Island. I'm from the Prairie Island Indian Reservation. I've lived there all my life, and I've seen the two towers go up when I was little and lived right across from the nuclear plant. And like the lady said, no. There's no more. You guys don't need to have any more applications to renew it. You know, I say, no. No more. That's enough. That's what I think.

Thank you.

MR. STORM: Thank you, Elizabeth.

Sigurd Anderson.

MR. ANDERSON: Thank you. My name is Sigurd Anderson. I live in Lake City. My name's spelling is S-I-G-U-R-D, last name Anderson,

A-N-D-E-R-S-O-N.

I'm here tonight to represent Communities United for Responsibile Energy, CURE. We were established in 1994, citizens of Florence Township and Lake City who were concerned about the possibility of having a nuclear spent fuel storage facility in our neighborhood. Thankfully that didn't happen.

We have -- we live more or less 20 miles downstream from the Prairie Island plant. On a humid evening we can see the plume from the cooling towers. We're well aware of our proximity to the plant, and the fact that we're located on Lake Pepin on the Mississippi River.

Our concern with the uprate of the plant is -- is chiefly environmental. We're concerned about the potential impact of more thermal energy being rejected into the water -- the river and its potential impact on the environment and the ecology of Lake Pepin. And also on our life and livelihoods in living along the lake.

Our other concern is the potential for release of additional radioactive elements into the environment -- into the air, primarily, but also into the river. And we're very concerned about the

fact that there apparently is no monitoring of the level of radiation that we receive, and there is no monitoring of the thermal impacts presently to the river and what may be in the future a greater impact.

In that line, we would like to request the establishment of an advisory task force for uprate, and I've got a proposal along those lines which I would like to have included in the record.

Thank you.

MR. STORM: Thank you, Sigurd. I recommend that you submit your request for the advisory task force to Burl Haar, the Executive Director of the Commission, as soon as possible, so that the Commission can get it on its agenda and a decision can be made relative to that.

Thank you very much.

Andru Peters.

MR. PETERS: Thank you, Mr. Storm.

I'm going to make two presentations. One for myself, shortly. The first one is on behalf of the City of Lake City. Along with Mr. Anderson, the honorable mayor had a conversation with me, so I'm submitting her written remarks. And she indicated to me she will formally follow up by October 7 -- a

formal report.

Here are her remarks: These remarks are made for the record on behalf of the Honorable Mayor Katie Himanga of Lake City, Minnesota. She was unable to attend the meeting this evening because of other city commitments. The concerns for Lake City community that emerged from conversation at meetings of both the Lake City Utility Board and the Lake City comment -- Council are as follows: One, long-term storage of nuclear waste. Two, thermal impact of service water discharged into the Mississippi River and Lake Pepin.

And she follows: We ask that the best available water dispersion modeling be used to assess the natural ecosystem and cultural impacts of thermal discharge, and there be a plan put in place to mitigate adverse impacts. That's her remarks.

Now my remarks. I'm going to kind of preface, I'm not privy to the exact, detailed documentations. It's probably about 40 inches, probably, of all the documentation regarding this project. I'm also going to kind of preface that I'm making the remarks when I was in the transportation industry in California and Nevada. In the 1990's I got involved in the Yucca Mountain or Yucca Plat

(phonetic) Mountain discussions. Highly controversial and some of the points that came up there I'm going to share with you here for consideration in your report.

One -- and also some local observations. One, I've been in conversation, or at least written-wise, with the United States Army Corps of Engineers. They are in the process, as you well know, of upgrading all the dams and locks in the upper Mississippi River. Lock and dam number three and number four have been upgraded. There are plans to take the channels down to 12 feet.

In the next 10 years there's talk about periodic water drawdown plans, and based on the conversation that the gentleman from Xcel has presented, it kind of alarmed me when he said that -- finally somebody admitted that water temperature is increasing with water drawdown -- increased water, you're going to drastically affect the ecology, plant and fish life on the river to include changing what, you know, we'd be having for fish.

Also, two, I don't see any dialog on shoreline management along with what the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is doing. So I think we need to

get them involved. I was looking at charts and they're missing. I think they're an integral part of that plant.

As far as the storage of the spent fuel rods, nowhere have I seen -- it's silent that is the storage solely for Prairie Island, or is this an avenue for the NRC to say, oh, gee, since we're extending the facility we now have temporary storage for other facilities? And that can lead into a whole host of other issues. And from the transportation industry, do we have certified companies? Are drivers certified to, you know, carry hazmat nuclear power -- nuclear waste materials?

And I don't see anything in emergency service training for the neighboring community in case, heaven forbid, there is a radiation leak at the facility. Nowhere do I see, unless it's one -- in that 17 inches of documents, you're talking about emergency training for personnel, city, county, and state, within a 50-mile radius of the nuclear plant.

From Yucca Mountain, the biggest concern that spent nuclear rods have is to be stored for 1,000 years. Nowhere do I see in your reports provisions for 1,000-year storage. I see 20-,

30-year plans. Okay. That's short term, what's long term? That type of thing, so I think that needs to be addressed.

Water temperature -- I'm going to challenge the gentleman from Xcel. Last January, case in point, first time in recorded history the entire Lake Pepin was ice-free. Never has that ever happened. I'm sorry, that's not global warming. Up until '70, '72, before the nuclear power plant, dump trucks fully loaded could drive across the lake. Two years ago, a human being -- Mr. Storm, you might have made it across without going through ice. That shows -- that tells me water temperature -- I've been assured by Xcel at other meetings, oh, yes, it goes back to the same temperature. I'm sorry. No, you don't change ice that drastically.

Another thing you need to address is Homeland Security and sabotage. I see no provisions for security. As you well -- in today's society, disgruntled employees, and, you know, with the advent of foreign interests, what a perfect way to take out an area. I see no addressing of radiation leaks and security, which then will cascade into the safety of the neighboring citizens, and as well as affecting the ecology.

I'll put this into writing and send it to you. My notes -- there's a lot of information. I want to at least raise some of the key points.

Thank you.

MR. STORM: Thank you, Andru. I encourage you to submit your comments in writing. And comparing me to a dump truck, I will ignore that. We have similar builds, so I'm not too worried about it.

Doreen Hagen.

MS. HAGEN: Hi. My name is Doreen Hagen, H-A-G-E-N, and I live on Prairie Island.

And when you showed the first pictures here, every time we go to a hearing or read anything in the papers, they never show pictures of the fact that Prairie Island Indian Community sits right next to the power plant. And I am adamantly against putting more casks on Prairie Island, and I will protest that as long as I can.

Because, you know, when they first put it there, they didn't ask us. They didn't get our approval. And that's why I'm here now telling you that I am against storing any more casks on Prairie Island. We live right next door to it, and we have been good neighbors to Red Wing and to Xcel, but now

I'm -- I'm adamant about it on no more casks. And I will submit more comments.

MR. STORM: Thank you, Doreen.

Kristen Eide-Tollefson.

MS. EIDE-TOLLEFSON: Kristen Eide-Tollefson, E-I-D-E, hyphen, T-O-L-L-E-F-S-O-N. And Kristin is K-R-I-S-T-E-N. I live in Lake City -- I don't live in Lake City, I live in Frontenac. And I was on the site advisory task force in 1995, and I also support the establishment of a task force. We'll be on that petition.

I think my primary -- stepping out sort of into a field here, but I think my primary comment that I have to make has to do with the fact that these are all connected actions. I'm fairly grateful, actually, that you're consolidating these into one docket. I don't know how I would ever sort out all the different statements I would have for the environmental review. But I think that the factors that made you put the EIS process together into one document are the -- some of the same reasons that, I think, within that document, it's critical to see and review the impacts of these connected actions.

There would be no uprate without a

relicensing. There would be no more casks without a relicensing. And the effects of the continued operation of the plant I would like to see evaluated for the cumulative impacts of these connected actions. And I will try to educate myself a little bit further to what that might mean in the context of the environmental review.

The -- the statute's requirement in requiring that when additional casks are evaluated that the steps of continued operation as well as groundwater safety is assured, am I correct about that?

MR. STORM: Correct.

MS. EIDE-TOLLEFSON: I -- Mr. Wadley spoke about offsite emissions, discharges, and I think one of the things that if Xcel is asking people to consider living with these plants for another 20 years, it's absolutely critical that those of us who live in the vicinity of the plant know something much more than we know now about where those emissions go, what the airflows are, what the water flows are for both kinds of emissions.

I think this is a really -- not only should be evaluated in the context of the

environmental review, but are really a primary covenant that the utility and the regulators should be making with the communities who live near and around the facility.

As far as groundwater goes, I'm particularly interested and concerned about tritium releases. And those weren't well evaluated in the Monticello docket, and we do have some material to submit on that.

The -- let's see. The issue of the waste, of course, is a very fundamental issue. The -- I believe for the purposes of the environmental review, that because there is no place for the waste from relicensed reactors to go. There is no federal plan for waste from relicensed reactors.

I would like the environmental review to study the engineering studies that were used to evaluate the no-action alternatives in the Yucca Mountain EIS. Those engineering studies looked primarily at the factors that accelerated the degrading of the storage containers and the storage facility. And that EIS stated that after 50 years some degradation would begin and that -- that releases, you know, it gives a timeline for

releases, and I think that that EIS is really relevant since we aren't actually living in a no-action alternative. If the federal government has no plans for the waste, then we are in a no-action alternative. And that's -- those are very good studies, and I don't know if they're still available on the web, but I can submit them.

At the same time, I think that if the waste -- if Xcel is asking for more casks for waste, that the alternatives for that docket should consider alternatives for storage. What are the alternatives for storage if, in fact, there is no place for the waste to go? Those alternatives should be evaluated.

My last point is that I'm very concerned about the timing of the uprate and the decommissioning dockets, because the uprate will be running the plant beyond thermal limits as we know it today. If that uprate -- if that uprate decision proceeds prior to the decommissioning decision -- or wait -- it's timed so that decommissioning documents -- the NRC won't be looking at the safety factors that are part of the uprate. So the additional heat won't be evaluated in the -- no, I'm sorry. In the relicensing safety evaluation and the

pool safety is also an issue with the heat.

So I will stop there. Thank you. I hope I didn't go over five minutes, and I'll submit comments. Thank you.

MR. STORM: As always, thank you, Kristen.

Art Owen.

MR. OWEN: Art Owen, O-W-E-N, last name. I, too, am from Prairie Island Indian Community, and as of -- as of the -- the beginnings of the nuclear plant. I was involved with it from the very beginning, in putting the footings in. And I've seen changes over the years, many, many drastic changes in the community, and I've seen the fatality rate go up as well. You know, we were a very calm community the one time. And as we look at the importance of EIS and how it involves the native people in our community, I ask that there should be some type of alignment between the both.

And it goes this way: If I am taught to understand that from the -- from the West the black nation comes, and his responsibility to us is going to be everlasting fire, which is the sun. And then we are of the red, which is the mother herself, we have that responsibility. And from the East is the

yellow, and that the yellow man, his responsibility is water. And the air was given to the Caucasian. Those are the four sacred colors that we understand. Do the people that are addressing these certificate of needs, are they in concern or have they taken into consideration of these as well?

For this year, I chose to take what is known as one of our ceremonies -- I chose to take one of the nuclear plant's trees in one of our ceremonies. And as our tribal chairman, he set up arrangements with security there. We had a ceremony right there on Xcel's ground. And for four days we prayed. No food, no water. We prayed about the kindness and calmness and compassion for man. And now we find out after we finished that this has come about, and there has been an application for this.

And it concerns me and my family as well, because I won't be here in a few years. So I'm going to tell you right now that I have lost many, many people in our family. And it's sometimes becoming a point where it's -- you look at the future. I have grandchildren, I have nieces and nephews, and what am I going to leave behind ?

You know, I came through the Vietnam War. We went through the anti-protests, we've been

through the whole thing. And I look back and I say here we are. And now as adult people, you know, we're addressing the future, and this is what we're going to do to them. And our concern in the past has always been the safety of our community.

And I'd like to share with you that the man that called me was my uncle, Artie Beman Owen (phonetic). He was the United States Marine Corps, retired. But his position in the world that he gave to us was to model the Iwo Jima War Memorial. He called from Arlington, Virginia one time, and he asked me, what is going on back there? And I said what do you mean? And he said there's been a leakage in the plant, are you aware of that? And we had no knowledge whatsoever that this had taken place. We had no knowledge whatsoever. We had to hear it from Virginia.

So those are things to take into consideration that, you know, we're looking to the future. You know, the number two is what's going to take care of our livelihood? As an Indian community, who takes care of our livelihood? Has that been brought about, has it been mentioned? You know, who takes care of my people? And my people concerns everybody in that four directions I just

told you about.

(Speaking different language.)

MR. STORM: Thank you, Art.

Carol Taylor.

MS. TAYLOR: Carol Taylor, T-A-Y-L-O-R.

Long -- a long time ago when the guys used to work at the NSP, they didn't know it -- they didn't know it then, but some Indian burial sites were on that land. And what did you guys do? You -- you bulldozed all their bones, and then you put a -- buildings there. Why, that's part of a burial grounds for Indians, our ancestors. And you still -- now you still want to put some more storage. Well, I think that's got to stop. That's got to stop.

MR. STORM: Thank you, Carol.

John Howey (sic).

MR. HOWE: Howe.

MR. STORM: I'm sorry, John.

MR. HOWE: I get that at the doctor's office, too.

John Howe, H-O-W-E. Given the significant nature of this project, communities that are in close proximity to the Prairie Island nuclear generating plant should be able to get granted

permission to develop a task force without the need to get a formal just cause petition to the court or to the Commission.

MR. STORM: Thank you, John, for your comment. But I do want to follow up that my rule here is to implement the rules and the procedures. The rules and procedures specify that if a citizen or the a group of citizens or an organization would like a task force, that they need to put that request in to the PUC. So I encourage you, if that's what you want -- if your group wants to get that in to the executive director of the PUC as soon as you can.

MR. HOWE: A follow-up question. Do they need to have just cause for that task force? What are the requirements?

MR. STORM: You know, when we're done here, let me pull my rule book out and look at it for you to see exactly what it specifies that has to be in that request. I'd be talking out of turn if I tried to remember off the top of my head, but I know the request has to go in to the Commission so the Commission can determine where to put it on the agenda and it can be heard. But see me after we're done here, and we'll pull the rule book out and we

can look at the wording of that language. Okay?

MR. HOWE: (Nods head.)

MR. STORM: Carol Duff.

MS. DUFF: Carol Duff, D-U-F-F. I serve on the Red Wing City Council.

I do believe in nuclear energy. I do believe that we have a well-managed plant here. However, I -- I shudder that we still have storage of dry casks. That -- I don't view this as waste, I view this as energy that is still in place, just sitting there. Europe, Japan, reprocesses this energy and there's far, far less true waste that's left at the end. We do need Yucca Mountain, but it's been a slow, slow process. And when we get there, anyone knows. And we need -- we need to think of the present time.

Yes, the waste -- or the risk is a calculated risk. Whenever you have a release of radiation, whenever you have increased thermal temperature, you're changing the environment. It's -- and the fact that we have a plant nearby increases the amount of emergency management drills that we need to process in order to keep ourselves safe when we live near a plant.

Homeland Security risks now, after 9/11,

means that there is great added cost to both our community and to the Prairie Island community as we need to protect ourselves from dangers in the future. So there -- there are risks associated with this.

MR. STORM: Thank you, Carol.

That completes my cards. Is there anyone who has not filled out a card who would like to speak? Just raise your hand. When I call on you, please stand up, state and spell your name for the court reporter.

This lady right here in front.

MS. SINGER: I'm Sarah Singer, and I live here in Red Wing.

And I have witnessed a man get many x-rays, and the more x-rays he got -- eventually he became eaten with cancer. I don't know -- and died. That was my husband. And I've heard of others. And I wouldn't like to get more -- exposed to more radiation than I need to.

I don't understand how you manage to calculate the safety. We are all individuals with variable sensitivity, and some of us get more x-rays, and on top of it, additional radiation. We have also the limestones here in -- and I don't

understand how you figure out the safety of the radiation, the emissions that come out of plant. And I wouldn't like to be exposed to more. I looked, we have occasionally, also, problems in the drinking water of radiation. And it's just -- I don't think it's a good idea.

MR. STORM: Could you spell your last name, please?

MS. SINGER: Singer, S-I-N-G-E-R.

MR. STORM: Anyone else? This gentlemen right here.

MR. NAUER: Yeah, my name is Arnold Nauer, N-A-U-E-R. I also live on Prairie Island, but I live on the east side of the plant. My mother lives right next to the plant.

And to comment on this gentleman's comment about nothing being tested, she has a box that sits in her yard that checks the air qualifications (sic), and she gets her water tested every month by Xcel and also by the state. And as far as I'm concerned, I've got no problem with them expanding.

Thank you.

MR. STORM: Thank you for your comment.

Anyone else? The lady in the back there,

in the green.

MS. RUST: My name is Carole Rust, and I'm from Roseville, the St. Paul area.

And a long time ago, I was aware when they were starting this, and at that time nobody could really answer what would happen to the casks if there was a really bad flood. That is a concern that I have. And maybe I don't know enough about this, but I have never heard that the casks are really that safe. The answer I heard at that time when they were talking about the safety of the casks was if they dropped them out of an airplane they'd be okay. But I didn't hear about what would happen to them if there was years of degradation, if there was water and other issues. And I don't live down here, but I have asked people over periods of time and nobody from Xcel or any other place that I can see can answer that question.

I do know that the state has changed its regulations, and right now flooding issues are looked at differently. And instead of looking at 100-year and 200-year floods, they're looking at 50-year floods. This makes it a lot easier because you don't have the really big ones as often. They don't have to worry about it.

So I would like to know from somebody what those plans are. And my understanding -- by the way, as somebody was bringing up Yucca Mountain, my understanding is if we were to take the residue that this country has now and put it in the Yucca Mountain right now, we would have no more room left. So we have no room even if we were to use Yucca Mountain right now.

So whatever you're doing, the power company needs to be looking at, one, alternatives. It needs to spend a lot more time realizing that these are going to be around for a very long time, and we are settling everybody with issues that won't go away. They're going to get worse. France is now getting into the same problem we have. They don't know what to do with their spent rods. And now they're looking around and they don't know what to do.

So I would definitely vote against this until NSP, and maybe the national government, for that matter, can come up with a better way of dealing with spent rods. And certainly from what I'm hearing today, there are a number of issues beyond that that it seems like are not well regulated to the extent that people can really count

on those regulations being in place for everybody all the time. If there's an issue with heat, that's going to be a very severe one for biodiversity and all of the environment.

If Xcel goes ahead and things are made very easy for them, basically, I think you're just going to have more of the same. So I think Xcel needs to make some hard plans when they could have been doing this a long time ago and they didn't. So I think it's a very bad answer to just say let's build more.

MR. STORM: Thank you for your comment. The gentleman straight ahead of me.

MR. BEARHEELS: My name is Pat BearHeels. I've been living --

MR. STORM: Could you spell your name, please, Pat?

MR. BEARHEELS: Patrick BearHeels, B-E-A-R-H-E-E-L-S. I've been living in the community off and on. I'm a non-tribal member. I'm from a different tribe.

I'm just worried about my kids' future. Me, I don't really care about my own, but I'm just worried about my kids. How's it going to be when they get older? Because my wife went through -- had

tumors and I didn't think these kids were going to have a mother, but she pulled out of it and that's what I was scared of for my kids. I'm worried about their future.

Thank you.

MR. STORM: Thank you.

Anyone else? Okay. I'm not seeing any other hands.

I want to remind you, if you have comments, please get them to me by October 7, end of business. If you have questions, don't hesitate to contact me any time. My business card is on the table. As Ray -- Ray is the public advisor, his business card is also up there. Please feel free to contact us.

If you're checking our website out and you run into a glitch, give me a call. I can walk you through it as we sit by our respective computers.

Anything else? I do appreciate you coming out. It's real important that people participate in these processes. The processes only work if you participate.

Thank you. And we'll be talking to you.

(Hearing adjourned at 8:37 p.m.)

STATE OF MINNESOTA)
) ss.
COUNTY OF HENNEPIN)

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I, Christine Munson, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing transcript, consisting of the preceding 69 pages is a correct transcript of my stenographic notes, and is a full, true and complete transcript of the proceedings to the best of my ability.

Dated September 19, 2008.

CHRISTINE MUNSON
Court Reporter